

### REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated, rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and objected to the drawings for a duplicate reference numeral. Claims 8, 9, 11-13, and 15 remain in the application.

The objection to the drawings was with respect to FIG. 2 having one circuit designated with numeral 60 and FIG. having a different circuit (logic) also designated with numeral 60. This duplication also occurred in the specification. The specification has been amended so that the logic of FIG. 3 is now designated with the numeral 91. Similarly, enclosed is a marked up FIG. 3 showing the change from 60 to 91 and a new drawing that reflects this change.

The rejection of the claims for anticipation was based on Laurenti. In this regard, the two remaining independent claims, claim 8 and 12, have been amended to include the elements of claims 10 and 14, respectively. In this regard, applicants submit that the amended independent claims now distinguish from Laurenti. The claimed arranger in both independent claims describes six multiplexers that are supported by multiplexers 80-90 of FIG. 2. The Examiner had cited encoders 1306, 1308, 1310, and 1312 of Laurenti as each anticipating applicants' claimed six multiplexers. Applicants, however, submit that these encoders are not taught as using multiplexers. These encoders are described by Laurenti at column 21, lines 1-26. This description is of AND/OR logic that applicants submit would require 44 logic gates. Further, the worst case data path would be 5 gates. There is no suggestion in Laurenti this described logic function could be achieved with multiplexers. Applicants' implementation as claimed only requires 6 multiplexers and the worst case data path is three. Accordingly, applicants submit that the claims presently in the application are neither anticipated nor made obvious by Laurenti.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By: James L. Clingan, Jr.  
James L. Clingan, Jr.  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 30,163  
Telephone: (512) 996-6839  
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854